

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

	W
D STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE States Patent and Trademark Office	- W
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS	1
P.O. Box 1450	1
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450	

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/567,472		02/07/2006	Petr Dobrovolny	J187-029 US	9391		
21706	7590	11/03/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER		
NOTARO AND MICHALOS				AULAKH, C	AULAKH, CHARANJIT		
100 DUTCH SUITE 110	HILL F	ROAD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ORANGEBURG, NY 10962-		Y 10962-2100		1625	<del> </del>		
				DATE MAILED: 11/03/2006	6		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	-			
Office Action Summary		10/567,472	DOBROVOLNY, PETR				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Charanjit S. Aulakh	1625				
The MAILING DATE of this of Period for Reply	communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of a lf NO period for reply is specified above, the new failure to reply within the set or extended period.	A THE MAILING DA e provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 of this communication. naximum statutory period w od for reply will, by statute, ee months after the mailing		N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1) Responsive to communication	on(s) filed on		·				
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> .		action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in co	ondition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is				
		x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending i	in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s)	is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are object	ed to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject t	o restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected	to by the Examiner	·.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on	•		Examiner.				
		frawing(s) be held in abeyance. See					
		on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	` '				
11) The oath or declaration is obj							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of		priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).				
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ No							
1. Certified copies of the							
		have been received in Application					
		ty documents have been receive	d in this National Stage				
application from the In							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
		•	• \				
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) 🔲 Interview Summary (					
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing F     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTC)		Paper No(s)/Mail Dai 5) Notice of Informal Pa					
<ol> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTC Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	//JB/U8)	6) Other:	пент Аррисацоп				
			•				

Application/Control Number: 10/567,472

Art Unit: 1625

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Page 2

1. Claims 1-5 are pending in the application.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 1-5, the term ---characterized in that ---- is vague. The applicants are suggested to use the term --- wherein ----.

In claim 1, the term ---manufacturing of ---- is vague. The applicants are suggested to use the term --- preparing or preparation of ----.

In claim 1, last line, the applicant's are suggested to delete ----a polar aprotic solvent, e.g. ---- since the specification teaches using only acetonitrile and furthermore, there is no mention of any other polar aprotic solvent besides acetonitrile.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/567,472 Page 3

Art Unit: 1625

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 6. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyasaka (U.S. Patent 4,604,463).

Miyasaka discloses a process for preparing 7-ethyl-10-[4-(1-piperdino)-1-piperdino]carbonyloxycamptothecin by reacting 7-ethyl-10-hydroxycamptothecin (compound of instant formula II) with 1-chlorocarbonyl-4-piperidinopiperidine (compounds of instant formula III, see example 28 in col. 25). The process of Miyasaka meets all the limitations of instant claims except that Miyasaka uses pyridine instead of instant 4-dimethylaminopyridine in the condensation reaction. However, the reactants (compounds of formulae II and III) and the product are identical in the process of Miyasaka and therefore, in absence of any unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use substituted pyridine instead of pyridine in the condensation process for preparing 7-ethyl-10-[4-(1-piperdino)-1-piperdino]carbonyloxycamptothecin.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charanjit S. Aulakh whose telephone number is

Application/Control Number: 10/567,472 Page 4

Art Unit: 1625

(571)272-0678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas McKenzie can be reached on (571)272-0670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Charanjit S. Aulakh Primary Examiner Art Unit 1625